arXiv:1404.0766v2 [cs.IT] 4 Mar 2016

Ornstein Isomorphism and Algorithmic Randomness

Mrinalkanti Ghosh [*1], Satyadev Nandakumar [†2], and Atanu Pal [‡3]

[1]Toyota Technological Institute at Chicago, Chicago IL 60637, USA
[2]Department of Computer Science and Engineering, Indian Institute of Technology Kanpur, Kanpur, UP, 208016, India
[3]Strand Genomics, Bangalore, India

March 7, 2016

Abstract

In 1970, Donald Ornstein proved a landmark result in dynamical systems, *viz.*, two Bernoulli systems with the same entropy are isomorphic except for a measure 0 set [22]. Keane and Smorodinsky [15] gave a finitary proof of this result. They also indicated how one can generalize the result to mixing Markov Shifts in [13]. We adapt the construction given in [15] to show that if two computable mixing Markov systems have the same entropy, then there is a Schnorr layerwise lower semicomputable isomorphism defined on all Schnorr random points in the system. Since the set of Schnorr random points forms a larger set than the set of Martin-Löf random points, which is a measure 1 set, it implies the classical result for such systems.

This result uses several recent developments in computable analysis and algorithmic randomness. Following the work by Braverman [3], Nandakumar [21], and Hoyrup and Rojas [10] introduced discontinuous functions into the study of algorithmic randomness. We utilize Hoyrup and Rojas' elegant notion of layerwise computability and Miyabe's definition of Schnorr integrable tests [20] to produce the test of randomness in our result.

We show that the result cannot be improved to include all points in the systems - only trivial computable isomorphisms exist between systems with the same entropy.

[*]mkghosh@ttic.edu
[†]satyadev@cse.iitk.ac.in
[‡]palatanu@cse.iitk.ac.in

1 Introduction

In the Kolmogorov program for algorithmic randomness, Martin-Löf established that there is a smallest constructive measure 1 set, whose objects are the set of individual random objects. Every effectively computable probabilistic law, *i.e.* law which holds with probability 1, specifies a "majority rule". Thus it is reasonable to ask if every such law is satisfied by every individual random object. This will *a fortiori* imply the classical theorem, since the set of random objects has probability 1. The effective versions have more intuitive content, since they show that if any object fails the particular law, then there is an algorithm which can "bet" and win unbounded amounts of money on it.

Indeed, very general theorems like the Strong Law of Large Numbers [33], the Law of Iterated Logarithm [34], and Birkhoff's Ergodic Theorem [35], [21], [7], [1] have been effectivized. Prior to the work of Braverman [3], only continuous functions were considered. Following the work of Braverman, Nandakumar [21] and Hoyrup and Rojas [11] have considerably broadened the class of functions to deal with discontinuities, which has led to considerably general theorems on the ergodic properties of random objects in Bienvenu et al., and [1], Franklin, Greenberg, Miller and Ng [4]. Recently, Hochman [8] and Hoyrup [12] independently resolved the long-standing open problem of the effectivization of the Shannon-McMillan-Breiman theorem.

In a recent line of work, Gács [5], and Gács, Hoyrup and Rojas [6], [11], [10] have extended the field of study of randomness to fairly general spaces other than the finite alphabet spaces which have traditionally formed the subject of algorithmic randomness. This also enables us to study the *relationships between* the random objects of different probability spaces. In this paper, we utilize this theory to study measure-preserving isomorphisms between effective dynamical systems. We prove an effective version of the celebrated Ornstein Isomorphism Theorem[22], by adapting the finitary proof of Keane and Smorodinsky [15].

Consider two dynamical systems $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu, T)$ and $(Y, \mathcal{C}, \nu, S)$[1] where X, Y are the sample space, $\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C}$ the σ-algebras, μ, and ν the probabilities, and T and S the measure-preserving transformations on X and Y respectively. A map $\phi : X \to Y$ is a factor map if $\phi T(x) = S\phi(x)$ for almost every $x \in X$. If ϕ is invertible then we say that X and Y are isomorphic. Isomorphisms help us to categorize dynamical systems into classes of systems which are essentially "encodings" of another system.

[1] definitions in Section 4.1

Kolmogorov and Sinai [18], [32] introduced the notion of the *entropy* of a dynamical system as an invariant of an isomorphism. They showed that if two systems are isomorphic to each other, then they have the same *Kolmogorov-Sinai* entropy. Ornstein and Weiss [24] show that this was a crucial insight – in a very broad sense, the Kolmogorov-Sinai entropy is the only invariant of the isomorphism. The Kolmogorov-Sinai theorem brought a fresh perspective to the study of dynamical systems. Formally, it justifies viewing purely deterministic dynamical systems as having positive entropy [26] – thus some deterministic systems can be viewed as "random".

The converse of the result, *viz.* that systems with the same Kolmogorov-Sinai entropy are isomorphic to each other, does not hold in general (see Billingsley [2]). However, Ornstein showed in a celebrated result, that if we restrict the systems to the broad class of "Bernoulli systems", then equal entropy systems are isomorphic to each other. Ornstein generalized this result to hold on the class of "finitely determined systems". Numerous examples of deterministic dynamical systems are isomorphic to the Bernoulli system, which is intuitively the most random system possible. (For a recent survey, see Ornstein [23].)

However, the isomorphism Ornstein constructs is not continuous (it cannot be continuous in general [27]) and is not directly amenable to the theory of algorithmic randomness. In 1979, Keane and Smorodinsky gave a *finitary* version of Ornstein isomorphism theorem. A map is called *finitary* if it is continuous except on a measure 0 set. The concept involves viewing the underlying systems as both probability and topological spaces. We adapt this proof to establish our result.

Our main result of the paper is the following:

(Main) Theorem 1. *If two effective mixing Markov systems have the same Kolmogorov-Sinai entropy, then there is a "layerwise computable" isomorphism which is defined on all Schnorr random objects of both the systems.*

Hoyrup and Rojas [10] have shown that layerwise computable functions can be used to characterize Schnorr randomness. Hence the above theorem will establish that there is an isomorphism which is defined between the sets of Schnorr random objects in the two systems.

Further, in Section 6, we show that this cannot be improved substantially – if we insist on a computable transformation which is defined on all points, then we have no non-trivial isomorphism.

This work crucially employs the concept of layerwise computability, which affords us the luxury of ignoring uncomputability of a function on a large set of discontinuities. Our construction will diverge on many non-random

points. (For example, if a computable point x has only finitely many zeroes in its "encoding", then our map is undefined at that point.) This is an important difference from the result of Keane and Smorodinsky (see Theorem 17 of [14]), where the points of divergence of the construction are immaterial. We show that for every Schnorr random object, the adapted Keane-Smorodinsky construction converges – in particular, in a layerwise computable manner. Consequently there is a pointwise isomorphism between the set of random objects in the two systems.

2 Assumptions and Notations

In this section we describe our notations for the proof developed in section 4. In order to facilitate easy detection of parallel constructs and differences between our proof and that of Keane and Smorodinsky [15], we closely follow notations of the exposition in Chapter 6 of Petersen [27].

We are given two finite alphabet stationary mixing Markov systems $\mathcal{A} = ((\Sigma_A)^{\infty}_{-\infty}, P_A, T_A)$ and $\mathcal{B} = ((\Sigma_B)^{\infty}_{-\infty}, P_B, T_B)$ on alphabet sets Σ_A and Σ_B respectively, with equal entropy. Note that all the conditional probabilities are bounded away from 0 or 1.

Let ε_r denote $\varepsilon_r = \frac{1}{2^r}$ for any natural number r. We assume that the probabilities of the given systems are computable. To be precise, we assume that we have a Turing machine M_A for the system $\mathcal{A}$ (and M_B for $\mathcal{B}$) so that given a string $x \in \Sigma_A^*$ (correspondingly, $x \in \Sigma_B^*$) and a natural number n, $M_A(x, n)$ ($M_B(x, n)$ for $\mathcal{B}$) returns a rational number approximating the probability of a cylinder x within $\varepsilon_n P_A(x)$ of $P_A(x)$ ($\varepsilon_n \cdot P_B(x)$ for $\mathcal{B}$). We denote this approximation by $P_A(x, n)$ and $P_B(x, n)$ respectively. Note that, since the dynamical systems are assumed to be stationary, we do not care about the position of the cylinder.[2]

Given a probability vector P, we denote its entropy as $H(P)$. From the above assumption, we can infer that the entropy of the systems is computable, i.e., we have a Turing machine M, which on input n, gives a ε_n approximation of the entropy H.

3 Overview of the construction

First, we reduce the problem of construction of isomorphism between two mixing Markov systems of equal entropy to one where two systems have

[2]There is little difference between the requirements of having additive error of ε_n and additive error of $\varepsilon_n \cdot P_A(x)$, except that the later is more convenient for our purpose.

a common probability weight. We call this the Marker Lemma, analogous to Keane and Smorodinsky. Our construction differs in that all our systems are mixing Markov systems, unlike the Bernoulli systems in [15]. This lemma allows us to assume, without loss of generality, that the symbol 0 has identical probability in the two systems.

A remark is due here about a false lead – it may appear that if such an intermediate construction succeeds, we can iterate the construction and construct an isomorphism between the alphabets which *a fortiori* yields a pointwise measure-preserving isomorphism. This is not possible in general because the non-trivial cases of Ornstein isomorphism are precisely when $|\Sigma_A| \neq |\Sigma_B|$, and we reach an impasse when we have an odd number of symbols in one alphabet, and an even number of symbols in the other.

Then, we construct an isomorphism between the random objects in two mixing Markov systems $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{C}$ with equal entropy and with identical probability for 0, in stages. First, for a random object x, we call the pattern of 0s with all other symbols replaced by $\sqcup$ as the skeleton of x. For $x \in \mathcal{A}$, we identify potential images as those sequences $y \in \mathcal{C}$, which have identical skeletons. This is enabled by the effective Skeleton Lemma. This is the first step to identify potential images of x under the isomorphism. We now restrict the choices available progressively, until we remain with a unique image for x, through the following stages.

Once we have identified sequences in $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{C}$ with identical skeletons, we have to "fill in" the non-zero positions by producing a measure-preserving bijection between equal length strings from the two systems. The definition and technical results about these strings form the "effective filler lemma". In this stage, we identify "filled-in" strings from $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{C}$ which could potentially be isomorphically mapped to each other. The existence of strings in the two systems with simultaneously the same length and approximately the same entropy is a consequence of the asymptotic equipartition property. This portion of our proof varies in an essential manner from that of Keane and Smorodinsky.

This potential mapping between the strings of $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{C}$ can be naturally modeled as a bipartite graph. Finally, we prove a version of the Marriage Lemma to form the bijection between the strings in the two sequences, which forms a basis for the construction of the layerwise computable bijection between the two systems. In the limit, we will map every random infinite sequence x in the first system to a unique random infinite sequence y from the second and vice versa. We will justify that the overall construction is a layerwise computable function.

3.1 Relevance of the Assumptions

We crucially use the notion of Schnorr layerwise computable functions from the theory of algorithmic randomness. Further, instead of the effective Shannon-McMillan-Breiman theorem which holds for Schnorr random points, we use the asymptotic equipartition property of mixing Markov chains. We now broadly justify the appropriateness of these assumptions.

Our algorithm relies on the fact that for any point in the support of the isomorphism, we can find skeletons of any given rank. This is true for all Schnorr random points, which is crucial in ensuring that our construction is Schnorr layerwise computable. On the other hand, for several computable points – for instance, for periodic sequences, skeletons of only finitely many lengths occur. Thus the set of points where our algorithm diverges is *dense*. Hence it seems difficult to adapt topologically inspired notions of discontinuous functions like that of Braverman [3] or Nandakumar [21] for our purpose, and measure-theoretic notions of computable discontinuous functions like layerwise computability are considerably more natural to deal with.

Second, the filler lemma for finding fillers for the skeleton relies on the fact that *for every Schnorr random point*, we can find filler strings satisfying a certain entropy bound. The classical Shannon-McMillan-Breiman theorem gives us only an almost everywhere behavior which leaves the possibility that the construction may fail for *a nonempty measure 0 subset* of Schnorr random points. The effective Shannon-McMillan-Breiman theorem of Hochman [8] and Hoyrup [12] provides the assurance that we can find such fillers for *every* Martin-Löf random point. However, we need the stronger assurance that the fillers will exist for every Schnorr random. In order to do this, we have to work directly with the asymptotic equipartition property for mixing Markov chains. Even though the classical property is a weaker version of the Shannon-McMillan-Breiman theorem, here, this version gives us sufficiently precise estimates for the Schnorr layerwise computable function.

4 Preliminaries

In this section, we briefly explain the definition of concepts and notation which we use in our result. First, we introduce the background from dynamical systems, and second, that from algorithmic randomness.

4.1 Kolmogorov-Sinai Entropy

Kolmogorov [17] and Sinai [32] introduced the notion of the entropy of a *transformation*, analogous to Shannon entropy, which proved a fruitful tool in the classification of dynamical systems. This notion is, in an essential sense, the only invariant of a dynamical system – all other natural invariants are continuous functions of the entropy [24]. We now describe the notion of Kolmogorov-Sinai entropy.

A probability space is a triple $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$, where X is a sample space, $\mathcal{B}$, a σ-algebra on X, and μ, a probability distribution on $\mathcal{B}$. Let $T : X \to X$ be a measurable map. The transformation T is called *measure-preserving* if for any measurable set $B \in \mathcal{B}$, $\mu(T^{-1}B) = \mu(B)$. A measure-preserving map T is called an *ergodic map* if every set $B \in \mathcal{B}$ where $T^{-1}B = B$ has measure either 0 or 1.

Definition 2. A quadruple $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu, T)$ where $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$ is a probability space and $T : X \to X$ is an ergodic map, is called a *dynamical system*.

We now proceed to the definition of entropy of a dynamical system. The chief idea is to introduce a notion analogous to a finite alphabet. Given any dynamical system $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu, T)$, we can associate it with a process involving finitely many states. Let $\alpha = (A_1, A_2, \ldots, A_n)$ be a finite collection of measurable subsets of X which are pairwise disjoint except for measure 0 sets, and cover X except possibly for a measure 0 set. We can think of the partition containing $x \in X$ as its 0^{th} "character" – that is, if $x \in A_i$, then we write $x[0] = i$.

The *entropy of a partition* α is defined to be $H(\alpha) = -\sum_{i=1}^{n} \mu(A_i) \log_2 \mu(A_i)$. Then for any integer i, $T^{-i}\alpha$ is the set $(T^{-i}(A_1), \ldots, T^{-i}(A_n))$. This set also partitions X, since T is a measure-preserving transformation. Now, we need to define concepts analogous to "subsequences". For this, we introduce the notion of refinement of partitions.

If $\alpha = (A_1, \ldots, A_n)$ and $\beta = (B_1, \ldots, B_m)$ are two partitions of X, then the *join of the partitions*, $\alpha \vee \beta$ is defined to be the partition

$$(A_i \cap B_j \mid i = 1, \ldots, n \; ; \; j = 1, \ldots, m).$$

For any sequence of integers $i_1, \ldots, i_k$, we then consider the "least common refinement" $\alpha[-k+1 \ldots 0]$, denoted $\alpha \vee T^{-1}\alpha \vee \ldots \vee T^{-k+1}\alpha$. [3] For any point $x \in X$, the cell containing x in this refinement represents the characters in the positions $-k+1, \ldots, -1, 0$.

[3] The convention of starting from negative indices is standard in the literature on dynamical systems.

Using this, for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we define the k-entropy of the system as $H_k(\alpha) = \frac{1}{k} H(\alpha \vee T^{-1}\alpha \vee \ldots \vee T^{-k+1}\alpha)$, which represents the average entropy rate of the letters $x[-k+1 \ldots 0]$ of any point $x \in X$. Finally, the asymptotic rate of entropy induced by the partition α is defined $\lim_{k\to\infty} H_k(\alpha)$. This limit exists for every stationary, in particular, ergodic systems.

Definition 3. The *entropy* of the ergodic system $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu, T)$ *with respect to the partition* α is $h(\alpha, T) = \lim_{k\to\infty} \frac{1}{k} H_k(\alpha)$.

Let $\Pi(X)$ denote the set of all finite partitions of X. The *Kolmogorov-Sinai entropy of the transformation* T is defined to be

$$h(T) = \sup_{\alpha \in \Pi(X)} h(\alpha, T). \tag{1}$$

The supremum in (1) is not easy to compute in general. However, there is a case where the supremum is attained by a fairly simple partition α. We say that α is a *generator* of $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu, T)$ if $\alpha \vee T^{-1}\alpha \vee \cdots = \mathcal{B}$ – that is, if α generates the full σ-algebra $\mathcal{B}$. In this case, we have the famous Kolmogorov-Sinai theorem.

The Kolmogorov-Sinai Theorem. *[17], [32] If α is a generator with respect to T, then $h(\alpha, T) = h(T)$.*

This has the consequence that for computable dynamical systems with a computable generator, the entropy is computable. For a given dynamical system, from now on, we will assume that a generating partition is given and thus we can view the dynamical system as an alphabet process with left shift being the ergodic transform from the space to itself.

The notion of entropy was then used to settle an open question. This involves the relationship between two dynamical systems $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu, T)$ and $(Y, \mathcal{C}, \nu, S)$.

Definition 4. Two dynamical systems $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu, T)$ and $(Y, \mathcal{C}, \nu, S)$ are said to be *isomorphic* to each other if there is a measure preserving invertible map $\phi : X \to Y$ such that $\phi T(x) = S\phi(x)$ for μ-almost every $x \in X$.

Now let us observe the following: $\phi(x)[i] = (S^i(\phi(x)))[0] = (\phi(T^i x))[0]$. Hence as long as we can compute the central coordinates of the images for $T^i x$ (for all $i \in \mathbb{Z}$), we can compute the isomorphism $\phi(x)$. So, from now on we only wish to determine the central alphabet of the image under the isomorphism.

Kolmogorov proved the following theorem.

Theorem 5. *(Kolmogorov [17]) If two dynamical systems are isomorphic, then they have the same Kolmogorov-Sinai entropy.*

He used this to negate the existence of a specific isomorphism by showing that the systems involved had different entropies. [2]

The converse of the question does not hold in general. To see some examples, see Section 5 of Billingsley [2]. However, Ornstein showed a powerful result: that for a large class of systems, called *finitely determined systems*, the converse of Kolmogorov's theorem is true – that is, if two such systems have the same entropy, then there is an isomorphism between them [25]. This construction cannot be "continuous" in general. In a more specific context, Keane and Smorodinsky [15] gave a finitary construction between two Bernoulli systems of the same entropy. We introduce the terminology below.

Definition 6. An isomorphism is called *finitary* if for almost every $x \in X$ there exists a $j \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for every $x' \in X$, such that $x[-j \dots 0 \dots j] = x'[-j \dots 0 \dots j]$, we have that $(\phi x)[0] = (\phi x')[0]$.

Note that this j exists only for a measure 1 subset of X, and not necessarily for every point in it. Also, the j depends on the specific x that we choose. Keane and Smorodinsky proved that for Bernoulli systems, Ornstein's construction can be made finitary.

Theorem 7. *[15] If $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu, T)$ and $(Y, \mathcal{C}, \nu, S)$ are two Bernoulli systems with the same Kolmogorov-Sinai entropy, then there is a finitary isomorphism between $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu, T)$ and $(Y, \mathcal{C}, \nu, S)$.*

In our work, we show that the above construction can be utilized to construct a layerwise lower semicomputable isomorphism between the sets of algorithmically random objects of two computable mixing Markov dynamical systems. To introduce this strengthening, we now give an overview of the setting of algorithmic randomness.

4.2 Algorithmic Randomness and Layerwise Tests

One of the important applications of the theory of computing is in the definition of *individual* random objects, finite strings and infinite binary sequences in a mathematically robust way – first defined using constructive measure theory by Martin-Löf [19]. In this paper, we mention a recent generalization of the theory of algorithmic randomness to fairly general spaces, namely, computable metric spaces. Gács [5], and Gács, Hoyrup and Rojas, in a

series of works [6], [11] have shown that there are universal tests of randomness in these general spaces. In this paper, we will deal with the Cantor space, where most of the general theory is not directly required. However, we need this theory for two specific purposes – first, we need the definition of a computable probability space. Second, the general theory of computable metric spaces is used to define the notion of layerwise computability [11], [10] which provides a more flexible way to determine whether an element of the space is algorithmically random. This theory plays a crucial role in our result.

Definition 8. A space (X, d) is called a *computable metric space* if it satisfies the following.

1. X is separable – *i.e.*, it has a countable dense subset $\mathcal{S}$.
2. $\mathcal{S} = \{s_i \mid i \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is a computably enumerable set.
3. For any $s_i, s_j \in \mathcal{S}$, $d(s_i, s_j)$ are uniformly computable real numbers.

If $x \in X$ and $r > 0$, then the metric ball $B(x, r)$ is the subset of X of points at less than r distance from x. We consider a set of ideal balls $\mathcal{N} = \{B(s, q) \mid s \in \mathcal{S}, q \in \mathcal{Q}\}$. The set of ideal balls is associated with a canonical computably enumerable numbering $\mathcal{N} = \{B_i \mid i \in \mathbb{N}\}$.

Example 9. The unit interval $[0, 1]$ endowed with the Euclidean metric, is a computable metric space. The set of dyadic rationals $\{\frac{m}{2^k} \mid m, k \in \mathbb{N}\}$is a computably enumerable dense subset $\mathcal{S}$. The set of canonical balls is then uniquely determined.

Pick any computable enumeration of the rationals. Then it is routine to utilize this to produce a canonical enumeration of the set of ideal balls. □

Definition 10. An *effectively open set* is an open set U such that there is a computably enumerable set of indices $E \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ with $\cup_{j \in E} B_j = U$.

Thus effectively open sets are the analogues of computably enumerable sets. Similarly, we can define notions of computability on these metric spaces. A function $f : X \to [-\infty, \infty]$ is *lower semicomputable* if the sets $f^{-1}(q, \infty]$ are uniformly effectively open. A function $f : X \to [-\infty, \infty]$ is *upper semicomputable* if $-f$ is lower semicomputable, and is computable if it is both upper and lower semicomputable.

Definition 11. Let $(X, d, \mathcal{S})$ be a computable metric space. A Borel probability measure μ on X is *computable* if the probability of any finite union of canonical balls is computable.

In other words, there is a machine, which for every ϵ and every finite union of cylinders C, returns a rational number with ϵ of the probability of C.[4]

Example 12. For the previous example, the Borel measure generated by specifying that $\mu((x, y]) = |y - x|$ is a computable probability measure. □

Hoyrup and Rojas [11] prove an effective Prokhorov theorem for computable probability measures on computable metric spaces, which is the basis for their new definition of algorithmic randomness. For this, first we need the notion of a layerwise lower semicomputable function.

A *Martin-Löf test* O is a sequence of uniformly effectively open sets O_n such that for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $P(O_n) < \frac{1}{2^n}$. A point x is said to be Martin-Löf random if for every Martin-Löf test O, $x \notin O_n$ for some n. If P is a computable probability measure, then the set of Martin-Löf points has P measure 1.

Every computable probability space (X, P) also has a universal Martin-Löf test – that is, there is a Martin-Löf test U such that $x \in X$ is Martin-Löf random if and only if there is an $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $x \notin U_n$.

Definition 13. [11], [9] Let (X, P) be a computable probability space. Let U be a universal Martin-Löf test for P. Then the sequence of compact sets $\langle K_n \rangle_{n=0}^{\infty}$ where $K_n = X - U_n$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, is defined as the *layering* of the space. For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ is called the n^{th} *layer* of the space.

Definition 14. A lowersemicomputable function $f : X \to \mathbb{R}$ is called *layerwise lowersemicomputable* if it is uniformly computable on $\langle K \rangle_{n=1}^{\infty}$.

The layerwise lower semicomputable functions may be undefined on every point that is not Schnorr random. This is important since our construction diverges on many (but not necessarily all) nonrandom points.

Definition 15. A *layerwise integrable test* is a layerwise lower semicomputable function $t : X \to [0, \infty]$ such that $\int t d\mu$ is finite.

A point $x \in X$ is Martin-Löf random if for every layerwise integrable test t, we have $t(x) < \infty$.

The integrable function can be thought of as a martingale process. Thus a point is Martin-Löf random if no layerwise lowersemicomputable martingale can win unbounded money on it. We deal with a slightly stronger notion, *viz.*, Schnorr layerwise computability. We use a definition due to Miyabe [20].

[4] This is a more restricted notion than that considered in Hoyrup and Rojas [7].

Definition 16. (Miyabe [20]) A Martin-Löf integrable test f is a *Schnorr integrable test* if there is a computable sequence of rational-valued step functions $\langle s_n \rangle$ converging to f pointwise such that $||s_{n+1} - s_n||_1 < 2^{-n}$.

We will construct an isomorphism between two spaces which is layerwise lower semicomputable. Then we argue that the composition of the layerwise test on the domain and the isomorphism constitutes a layerwise test on the range.

5 Construction of the Isomorphism

5.1 Effective marker lemma - intermediate Markov system

In this section, given two systems $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ with same entropy, we designate one alphabet from each of $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$, say 0 and 1. We then construct a mixing Markov chain $\mathcal{C} = (\Sigma_C, P_C)$ with designated alphabets $0, 1$ and with the following properties:

1. $P_A(0) = P_C(0)$ and $P_A(00) = P_C(00)$, i.e., probabilities of cylinders containing only 0s are same in $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{C}$.
2. Similarly for the system $\mathcal{B}$ and alphabet 1: $P_B(1) = P_C(1)$ and $P_B(11) = P_C(11)$.
3. Entropy of $\mathcal{C}$ is same as that of $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$.
4. $P_C(\omega)$ is computable for any $\omega \in \Sigma_C^*$.

Here the conditions 3 and 4 are somewhat opposing in nature: Since the entropy of $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ can be arbitrary large we may want to set the probabilities of $\mathcal{C}$ somewhere close to uniform distribution (while maintaining probabilities of 0s and 1s). But due to computable nature of probabilities of $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ we have only approximates available for the target entropy (the entropy is also computable). Because the gradient of the entropy function near the uniform distribution is almost horizontal, we may need to make substantial (multiplicative) change in probabilities of system $\mathcal{C}$ to match the target entropy within acceptable error. But this breaks the computability requirement of the probabilities of $\mathcal{C}$.

However, we are able to manage the two competing requirements simultaneously. We give a recursive procedure to get approximate probabilities for the system $\mathcal{C}$. First we make sure that the probabilities of 0s and 1s are matched to that of $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ within acceptable error. Then we enforce a

lower and upper bound on the conditional probabilities of the system $\mathcal{C}$. The lower-bound enforces that the system $\mathcal{C}$ is (fast enough) mixing – we require this lower bound in further sections. The upper-bound is carefully chosen so that the entropy of $\mathcal{C}$ can match that of $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ while the gradient is steep enough so that we only need to make small change in probabilities to make the required change in entropy. This allows us to produce a sequence of approximates to the probability distribution of $\mathcal{C}$ while maintaining all the above mentioned requirements.

The formal details of the outline mentioned above is as follows: Let H be the entropy of the systems $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ and the memory of the Markov processes $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ be 1. Let 0 be a symbol in $\mathcal{A}$ which minimizes the following conditional probability: $P_A(x[1] = a \mid x[0] = a)$, where a is in $\mathcal{A}$ (breaking the ties arbitrarily from an approximation of probabilities up to a small enough error). Similarly, let 1 be a symbol in $\mathcal{B}$ which minimizes the following conditional probability: $P_B(x[1] = b \mid x[0] = b)$, where b is in $\mathcal{B}$.

We construct the intermediate system $\mathcal{C}$ to be of memory 1. We let the alphabet of the system $\mathcal{C}$ to be $\Sigma_C = \{0, 1, \ldots, c\}$, where c is determined later.

We consider the set of Π_0 probability distributions on Σ_C^2 such that in each distribution, each element of Σ_C^2 has probability > 0 (in fact we will ultimately use a stronger lower bound). For brevity, let us denote P_{xa} to be the probability of the string xa, where $x, a \in \Sigma_C$, in the distribution $P \in \Pi_0$. Let us also denote $P_x = \sum_{a \in \Sigma_C} P_{xa}$. Note that when P is a distribution which describes a Markov process, the entropy of the process is defined as (the conditional entropy conditioned on first step): $h(P) = \sum_{xa \in \Sigma_C^2} P_{xa} \log \left(\frac{P_x}{P_{xa}}\right)$[5].

Let $p_0 = P_A(\omega[1] = 0 \mid \omega[0] = 0)$ and $p_1 = P_B(\omega[1] = 1 \mid \omega[0] = 1)$. Let α be the value which, if assigned to $P_C(\omega[1] = 0 \mid \omega[0] = x)$ for all $x \in \Sigma_C \setminus \{0\}$, yields $P_C(0) = P_A(0)$. A simple computation shows: $\alpha = \frac{P_A(0)(1-p_0)}{1-P_A(0)}$. Similarly, let β be the value of that needs to be assigned to $P_C(\omega[1] = 1 \mid \omega[0] = x)$ for all $x \in \Sigma_C \setminus \{1\}$ to ensure $P_C(1) = P_B(1)$. Also similar equality for β holds: $\beta = \frac{P_B(1)(1-p_1)}{1-P_B(1)}$

Let $\gamma = \alpha + \beta$. Let $\eta, \delta > 0$ be two parameters to be determined later. In what follows, we restrict ourselves to probability distributions in $\Pi \subset \Pi_0$ which have the following properties:

[5] For simplicity let us assume that the base of the logarithm is e – this only changes entropy by a constant factor. One can perform similar computation by appropriately multiplying the constant $\log_2 \mathrm{e}$.

- $P_{x0} = P_x \cdot \alpha$ for all $x \in \Sigma_C \setminus \{0\}$.
- $P_{00} = P_A(\omega[0] = 0, \omega[1] = 0)$.
- $P_{x1} = P_x \cdot \beta$ for all $x \in \Sigma_C \setminus \{1\}$.
- $P_{11} = P_B(\omega[0] = 1, \omega[1] = 1)$.
- For all $x \in \Sigma_C$ and $a \in \Sigma_C \setminus \{0, 1, c\}$, $P_{xa} \leq \delta P_x$, i.e., δ is an upper-bound on the conditional probabilities on all but the symbols $0, 1$ and c.
- For all $x \in \Sigma_C$ and $a \in \Sigma_C \setminus \{0, 1, c\}$, $P_{xa} \geq \eta P_x$, i.e., η is a lower-bound on the conditional probabilities on all but the symbols $0, 1$ and c.

We observe that Π is closed under convex combinations, i.e., Π is convex. We exhibit a distribution in Π to show that it is non-empty. For any distribution in Π the probabilities of cylinders containing only 0s matches that of $\mathcal{A}$ and similarly probabilities of cylinders containing only 1s matches that of $\mathcal{B}$. Also note that only fixing the conditional probabilities is enough to specify the distribution, since the conditional probabilities specify an unique stationary distribution. For the construction of $\mathcal{C}$, we only restrict ourselves to distributions in Π. We call a distribution $\mu \in \Pi$ to be an interior distribution if all the inequalities are satisfied strictly.

We let $\eta = \frac{1}{c(c-3)}$. Consider the distribution Q corresponding to the following conditional probabilities:

$$\frac{Q_{xa}}{Q_x} = \begin{cases} \eta & \text{if } a \neq 0, 1, c \\ \alpha & \text{if } x \neq 0 \text{ and } a = 0 \\ \beta & \text{if } x \neq 1 \text{ and } a = 1 \\ p_0 & \text{if } x = 0 \text{ and } a = 0 \\ p_1 & \text{if } x = 1 \text{ and } a = 1 \\ 1 - \sum_{b \neq c} \frac{Q_{xb}}{Q_x} & \text{if } a = c \end{cases}$$

Note that the stationary distribution for this is given by

$$Q_a = \begin{cases} P_A(0) & \text{if } a = 0 \\ P_B(1) & \text{if } a = 1 \\ \eta & \text{if } a \neq 0, 1, c \\ 1 - P_A(0) - P_B(1) - (c-3)\eta & \text{if } a = c \end{cases}.$$

So, by construction $Q \in \Pi$ (and hence Π is non-empty). Now the entropy of Q is:

$$\begin{aligned}
h(Q) =& \sum_{xa} Q_{xa} \log \frac{Q_x}{Q_{xa}} \\
=& \sum_{x\neq 0,1} \left(Q_x \alpha \log \frac{1}{\alpha} + Q_x \beta \log \frac{1}{\beta} + \sum_{a\neq 0,1,c} Q_{xa} \log \frac{1}{\eta} + Q_{xc} \log \frac{1}{1-\gamma-(c-3)\eta} \right) \\
&+ \left(Q_0 p_0 \log \frac{1}{p_0} + Q_0 \beta \log \frac{1}{\beta} + \sum_{a\neq 0,1,c} Q_{0a} \log \frac{1}{\eta} + Q_{0c} \log \frac{1}{1-p_0-\beta-(c-3)\eta} \right) \\
&+ \left(Q_1 p_1 \log \frac{1}{p_1} + Q_1 \alpha \log \frac{1}{\alpha} + \sum_{a\neq 0,1,c} Q_{1a} \log \frac{1}{\eta} + Q_{1c} \log \frac{1}{1-p_1-\alpha-(c-3)\eta} \right) \\
=& (1-Q_0)\alpha \log \frac{1}{\alpha} + Q_0 p_0 \log \frac{1}{p_0} + (1-Q_1)\beta \log \frac{1}{\beta} + Q_1 p_1 \log \frac{1}{p_1} \\
&+ (c-3)\eta \log \frac{1}{\eta} + (1-Q_0-Q_1)(1-\gamma-(c-3)\eta) \log \frac{1}{1-\gamma-(c-3)\eta} \\
&+ Q_{0c} \log \frac{1}{1-p_0-\beta-(c-3)\eta} + Q_{1c} \log \frac{1}{1-p_1-\alpha-(c-3)\eta} \\
\overset{c\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} & \left((1-Q_0)\alpha \log \frac{1}{\alpha} + Q_0 p_0 \log \frac{1}{p_0} + (1-Q_1)\beta \log \frac{1}{\beta} + Q_1 p_1 \log \frac{1}{p_1} \right. \\
&\left. + (1-Q_0-Q_1)(1-\gamma) \log \frac{1}{1-\gamma} + Q_{0c} \log \frac{1}{1-p_0-\beta} + Q_{1c} \log \frac{1}{1-p_1-\alpha} \right)
\end{aligned}$$

for our choice of η. Now we notice that by considering $\mathcal{A}^m$ and $\mathcal{B}^m$ (i.e., new alphabets are m-tuple of old alphabets and new shifts to be old shift repeated m time), the limit value decreases (as p_0, p_1 doesn't increase and further, Q_0, Q_1 and hence α, β decreases) while the entropies of the systems $\mathcal{A}^m$, $\mathcal{B}^m$ increases (becomes mH). An isomorphism between $\mathcal{A}^m$ and $\mathcal{B}^m$ yields an isomorphism between $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$. We choose a suitable value of m so that limit value of $h(Q)$ becomes strictly less than the entropy of $\mathcal{A}^m$ and $\mathcal{B}^m$. We construct isomorphism between $\mathcal{A}^m$ and $\mathcal{B}^m$ and for simplicity of notations we ignore m from here on.

Let $\delta = \frac{1}{M(c-3)}$ for some large enough M to be determined later. Consider the following distribution R, as given by the conditional probabilities:

$$\frac{R_{xa}}{R_x} = \begin{cases} \delta & \text{if } a \neq 0, 1, c \\ \alpha & \text{if } x \neq 0 \text{ and } a = 0 \\ \beta & \text{if } x \neq 1 \text{ and } a = 1 \\ p_0 & \text{if } x = 0 \text{ and } a = 0 \\ p_1 & \text{if } x = 1 \text{ and } a = 1 \\ 1 - \sum_{b \neq c} \frac{Q_{xb}}{Q_x} & \text{if } a = c \end{cases}$$

As in previous case, the stationary distribution is given by:

$$R_a = \begin{cases} P_A(0) & \text{if } a = 0 \\ P_B(1) & \text{if } a = 1 \\ \delta & \text{if } a \neq 0, 1, c \\ 1 - P_A(0) - P_B(1) - (c-3)\delta & \text{if } a = c \end{cases}.$$

Following the previous computation, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} h(R) =& (1 - R_0)\alpha \log \frac{1}{\alpha} + R_0 p_0 \log \frac{1}{p_0} + (1 - R_1)\beta \log \frac{1}{\beta} + R_1 p_1 \log \frac{1}{p_1} \\ &+ (c-3)\delta \log \frac{1}{\delta} + (1 - R_0 - R_1)(1 - \gamma - (c-3)\delta) \log \frac{1}{1 - \gamma - (c-3)\delta} \\ &+ R_{0c} \log \frac{1}{1 - p_0 - \beta - (c-3)\delta} + R_{1c} \log \frac{1}{1 - p_1 - \alpha - (c-3)\delta} \\ =& \Theta\left(\frac{\log((c-3)M)}{M}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Hence for a fixed M, we can choose a large enough c so that $h(R)$ strictly surpasses H.

We treat h as a function $h : \mathbb{R}^{c^2} \to \mathbb{R}$, where we index the co-ordinates with corresponding string in Σ_C^2. Now:

$$\begin{aligned}
(\nabla h)_{xa} &= \frac{\partial h}{\partial P_{xa}} \\
&= \frac{\partial}{\partial P_{xa}} \left(\sum_{\substack{b \in \Sigma_C \\ b \neq a}} P_{xb} \log \frac{P_x}{P_{xb}} \right) + \frac{\partial}{\partial P_{xa}} \left(P_{xa} \log \frac{P_x}{P_{xa}} \right) \\
&= \sum_{\substack{b \in \Sigma_C \\ b \neq a}} P_{xb} \cdot \frac{P_{xb}}{P_x} \cdot \frac{1}{P_{xb}} + \log \frac{P_x}{P_{xa}} + P_{xa} \cdot \frac{P_{xa}}{P_x} \cdot \frac{P_{xa} - P_x}{P_{xa}^2} \\
&= \frac{P_x - P_{xa}}{P_x} + \log \frac{P_x}{P_{xa}} + \frac{P_{xa} - P_x}{P_{xa}} \\
&= \log \frac{P_x}{P_{xa}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Consider a third distribution (not necessarily in Π) defined as:

$$\frac{U_{xa}}{U_x} = \begin{cases} \alpha & \text{if } x \neq 0 \text{ and } a = 0 \\ \beta & \text{if } x \neq 1 \text{ and } a = 1 \\ p_0 & \text{if } x = 0 \text{ and } a = 0 \\ p_1 & \text{if } x = 1 \text{ and } a = 1 \\ \frac{1 - \frac{U_{x0}}{U_x} - \frac{U_{x0}}{U_x}}{c-2} & \text{if } a \neq 0, 1 \end{cases}$$

As earlier, we note that $U_a = \frac{1 - P_A(0) - P_B(1)}{c-2}$ for any $a \neq 0, 1$.

For a given interior distribution P in Π and let P' defined as: $P' = (1-\varepsilon)P + \varepsilon U$ for small enough ε so that $P' \in \Pi$. (Since the upper-bound on the conditional probabilities are strictly satisfied, adding very small quantity

to it doesn't violate the inequalities). Now:

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\langle \nabla h(P), P' - P \right\rangle =& \varepsilon \sum_{xa} \left(U_{xa} \log \frac{P_x}{P_{xa}} - P_{xa} \log \frac{P_x}{P_{xa}} \right) \\
=& \varepsilon \sum_{xa} U_{xa} \log \frac{P_x}{P_{xa}} - \varepsilon h(P) \\
=& \varepsilon \left(\sum_{x \neq 0} U_{x0} \log 1\alpha + \sum_{\substack{xa \\ a \neq 0,1,c}} U_{xa} \log \frac{P_x}{P_{xa}} + U_{00} \log \frac{1}{p_0} + U_{11} \log \frac{1}{p_1} \right. \\
& \left. + \sum_{x} U_{xc} \log \frac{P_x}{P_{xc}} \right) - \varepsilon h(P) \\
\geq& \varepsilon \sum_{\substack{xa \\ a \neq 0,1,c}} U_{xa} \log \frac{1}{\delta} - \varepsilon h(P) \\
=& \varepsilon \left((c-3) \cdot \frac{1 - P_A(0) - P_B(1)}{c-2} \log M(c-3) - h(P) \right)
\end{aligned}$$

Note that in Π, R has highest entropy (since it has most balanced probability distribution and R is majorized by every other distribution in Π). As we saw earlier, $h(R) = \Theta\left(\frac{\log c + \log M}{M}\right)$. So for a suitable choice of c, M (large enough) $\langle \nabla h(P), P' - P \rangle = \Omega(\varepsilon)$.

For the same P, let $P'' = (1+\varepsilon)P - \varepsilon U$. For small enough ε, we also note that $P'' \in \Pi$. By an argument similar to the previous one, we get: $\langle \nabla h(P), P - P'' \rangle = \Omega(\varepsilon)$.

Also note that both P', P'' changes probability values by at most $\mathrm{O}(\varepsilon)$.

Hence we can choose a c and corresponding M. We can choose a starting distribution in Π such that entropy of the distribution is close (up to, say ε) to H. Then for all large enough n, we can get n-th approximate for probabilities, the limit of which, defines the probability distribution of the intermediate system $\mathcal{C}$. By choice of Π, we note that probabilities of cylinders containing only 0s or only 1s are as desired. By appropriately modifying the probability distributions at each step (i.e., choosing P' or P'' for appropriate ε), the entropy of $\mathcal{C}$ can also be made to be equal to H.

5.2 An Effective Skeleton Lemma

We can now consider two systems $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{C}$ with $P_A(0) = P_C(0)$. We consider those pairs $(x, y) \in \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{C}$ such that their patterns of zeroes are "similar",

and progressively restricting this set, we will finally ensure an isomorphism for every pair of random sequences. For this, we now introduce the notion of a *skeleton*. The skeleton of a finite string is the string we obtain by mapping any non-zero symbol in it to a special character, say $\sqcup$. Consequently, if the patterns of 0s in two finite strings $x \in \Sigma_A^*$ and $y \in \Sigma_C^*$ are identical, then their skeletons are identical. In this subsection, we prove an effective version of Keane and Smorodinsky's Skeleton Lemma [15] (see also Chapter 6, Lemma 5.3 in Petersen[27]). What goes in the blank spaces is called a filler.

The strategy that we adopt in the isomorphism is to map sequences $x \in \Sigma_A^\infty$ to sequences $y \in \Sigma_C^\infty$ with identical skeletons. The first stage in the construction is to identify the set of potential pairs of infinite sequences with identical skeletons. To this end, we now define the notion of a skeleton of rank r, $r \in \mathbb{N}$, and show that Schnorr random sequences in any system have skeletons of all ranks. Owing to the fact that we have only approximation of probabilities of mixing Markov systems, we consider a different setting for skeletons and later, their fillers, from the one considered in [15] for Bernoulli process.

Assume that we have a sequence of positive integers $N_0 < N_1 < \ldots$. (This sequence will be fixed when we discuss the filler lemma, where we establish that it can be computed layerwise.) For a skeleton of rank r centered at position i in a sequence x, we look for the shortest substring centered at $x[i]$ starting and ending with N_r (or more) consecutive 0s. We replace all non-zero symbols with blanks. We replace all non-zero symbols with blanks. We further replace the maximal blocks of 0s[6] of length 1 (i.e., stand alone 0s) with blanks.

Definition 17. Let $x \in A^{\mathbb{Z}}$. A *skeleton* $S_{x,r,i}$ *of rank* r *in* $x = [.....x_{-2}x_1x_0x_1x_2.....]$ is defined as follows. Starting from $x[i]$, pick the shortest string of the form $0^{n_0}\sqcup^{\ell_1}0^{n_1} \ \ldots \ \sqcup^{\ell_k}0^{n_k}$ such that the following hold.

- Each ℓ_i is at least 1, $(1 \leq i \leq k)$.
- Each n_i is at least 2, $(1 \leq i \leq k)$.
- $n_i < N_r$ for all $1 \leq i \leq k-1$. Further, both n_0 and n_k are greater than or equal to N_r.

Thus, except for the extremities of the skeleton of rank r, there is no contiguous block of 0s longer than N_r. Also, it is routine to see that a rank-r skeleton can be uniquely decomposed into skeletons of rank $r-1$ [27].

[6] Here we deviate from the original construction.

We now show that the skeleton of every Schnorr random object in has skeletons of every rank r (with respect to any predetermined sequence $N_1 < N_2 < \ldots$ of numbers) while having sufficiently many blanks in between. This is an effective version of the Skeleton Lemma in [15].

Definition 18. The *length of the skeleton* $S_{x,r,i}$, denoted $\ell(S_{x,r,i})$, is defined as follows.

$$\ell(S_{x,r,i}) = |\{i \mid x_i \neq 0, \quad i \in S_{x,r,i}\}|$$

Lemma 19 (Schnorr Layerwise Skeleton Lemma)**.** *Let $\langle L_r \rangle_{r=1}^{\infty}$ be a computable increasing sequence of positive integers. Then there is a Schnorr layering $\langle K'_r \rangle_{r=1}^{\infty}$ of $\mathcal{A}$ and an increasing sequence of positive integers $\langle N_r \rangle_{r=0}^{\infty}$ uniformly computably enumerable in $\langle K'_r \rangle_{r=1}^{\infty}$ such that for every $r \in \mathbb{N}$ and every $x \in K'_r$, the following hold.*

- *There is a skeleton centered at $x[0]$ delimited by N_r many zeroes.*
- *The central skeleton centered at $x[0]$ and delimited by N_r many zeroes, has length at least L_r.*

Proof. Define $K'_r = \{x \in X \mid \ell(S_{x,r,0}) \geq L_r\}$. (Note that in this step, we choose $N_1, \ldots, N_r$ to determine the rank-r skeleton.)Thus K'_r contains all points x such that their "central skeleton" of rank r contains at least L_r many spaces.

Consider

$$K' = \cup_{n=1}^{\infty} \cap_{r=n}^{\infty} K'_r,$$

the set of points in X such that for large enough ranks r, a skeleton of rank r contains at least L_r many $\sqcup$ symbols. We form a Schnorr integrable test which attains infinity on each element in K'^c.

Any x in K'^c has either of two properties – first, x does not have any skeleton of rank r (or above), and second, for every n, there exists some rank $r \geq n$ such that x has a central skeleton having less than L_r many spaces. We will form a Schnorr layerwise integrable functions which will attain ∞ on x in either of these cases.

Case I. Suppose x has no central skeleton of rank r or more. By the pigeonhole principle, there is some rank $r' < r$ such that a rank r' skeleton appears infinitely often in x. Suppose r' is the highest rank which appears infinitely often in any skeleton of x, including non-central skeletons.

Let the left zero extremity (analogously, the right zero extremity) of a string w be the longest block of zeroes at the left end (correspondingly the right end) of w. (These may, of course be empty.) Let $ZE : \Sigma_A^* \to \{0\}^*$ be

the function which returns the shorter among the left zero extremity and right zero extremity.

Consider the following function defined on cylinders of Σ_A^∞. The function $f : \Sigma_A^* \to [0, \infty)$ is defined by

$$f(\lambda) = 1$$

$$f(a_1\ w\ a_2) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{(1-P_A(0w0|w))} f(w) & \text{if } |ZE(w)| = N_{r'} \text{ and } a_1a_2 \neq 00 \\ 0 & \text{if } |ZE(w)| = N_{r'} \text{ and } a_1a_2 = 00 \\ f(w) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Define the function $S : A^{\mathbb{Z}} \to [0, \infty)$ by $S(x) = \sup_n f(x[-n \dots 0 \dots n])$. Since P_A is computable, we can conclude that S is layerwise lower semicomputable.

For infinitely many n, a skeleton of rank r' will appear as the extremities of $x[-n \dots 0 \dots n]$. Hence the subsequent bits on the left and the right cannot both be 0. In this case, $f(x[-n-1 \dots 0 \dots n+1]) > f(x[-n \dots 0 \dots n])$. Thus, $S(x) = \infty$.

We observe that $\int f(\lambda) dP_A = 1$. Similarly, on any cylinder w, if w does not have extremities of the form 0^{N_r}, then $f(a_1wa_2) = f(w)$, and we have

$$\sum_{a_1a_2 \in \Sigma_A^2} f(a_1wa_2) P_A(a_1wa_2 \mid w) = f(w) \sum_{a_1a_2 \in \Sigma_A^2} P_A(a_1a_2 \mid w),$$

which is $f(w)$. If w ends in extremities of the form 0^{N_r}, then

$$\sum_{a_1wa_2 \in \Sigma^2 \setminus \{00\}} f(a_1wa_2) P_A(a_1wa_2 \mid w) = f(w) \frac{[1 - P_A(0w0 \mid w)]}{1 - P_A(0w0 \mid w)},$$

which is $f(w)$ as well. So we have that

$$f(w)P_A(w) = \sum_{a_1a_2 \in \Sigma^2} f(a_1\ w\ a_2) P_A(a_1\ w\ a_2).$$

Thus, it follows that

$$\int S(x) dP_A = \int \limsup_n f(x[-n \dots 0 \dots n]) dP_A \leq \sup_n \int f(x[-n \dots 0 \dots n]) dP_A = 1,$$

where the inequality follows by Fatou's lemma.

To show that the layering above is a Schnorr layering, we show that S is L^1-computable. We construct a computable sequence $\langle s_n \rangle_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ of computable

step functions pointwise converging to S where for all n, $||s_{n+1} - s_n||_1 \leq \theta^n$. [7] The step function $s_n : \Sigma^* \to \Sigma^*$ is defined by

$$s_n(axb) = \begin{cases} \max_{0 \leq i \leq |x|-1} f(x[-i \ldots i]) & \text{if } |x| \leq n \\ s_n(x) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

It is clear that $s_n \to S$ pointwise. Now, $s_n(\omega)$ and $s_{n+1}(\omega)$ differ only on those points where $\omega[-n \ldots n])$ has 0^{N_r} at both ends. Let us designate the set of strings $x \in \Sigma^n$ which end with 0^{N_r} as G.

$$\begin{aligned} \int |s_n(x) - s_{n+1}(x)| dP &= \sum_{x \in G, a, b \in \Sigma} |s_{n+1}(axb) - s_n(axb)| P(axb|x) P(x) \\ &= \frac{s_n(x)}{1 - P(0x0|x)} (1 - P(0x0|x)) P(x) + 0 \times P(x) \\ &\leq s_n(x) \theta^n. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that S is a Schnorr layerwise computable function.

The above argument shows that the set of sequences which lack a particular rank can be captured by a Schnorr layerwise integrable function. Now we show that sequences which lack some rank can be similarly captured by a Schnorr layerwise integrable test, by taking a convex combination of the individual tests, even though in general, there is no universal Schnorr test. Denoting the test for a particular rank by S_r, consider the test $S = \sum_{r=1}^{\infty} 2^{-r} S_r$. If there is an r and an $\omega \in A^{\mathbb{Z}}$ such that $S_r(\omega) = \infty$, then $S(\omega) = \infty$ as well. Since each S_r is monotone non-decreasing in the length of the string, so is S. Also, $\int S dP_A = \int \sum_{r=1}^{\infty} 2^{-r} S_r$, which is finite. We now show that S is L^1 computable.

For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, consider the rational step function $s_n = \sum_{i=1}^{n} 2^{-i} s_{i,n}$. As $n \to \infty$, this converges to S pointwise, since each individual sequence $\langle s_{i,n} \rangle_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges to S_i pointwise. We now have to show that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $||s_{n+1} - s_n||_1$ has a computable upper bound decaying exponentially in n, uniformly over n.

Now, since each $\langle s_{i,n} \rangle_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is monotone non-decreasing in n, it follows that $|s_{n+1}(x) - s_n(x)| = s_{n+1}(x) - s_n(x)$. By using the estimates on the

[7] Without loss of generality, the 2^n in the Definition 16 may be replaced by any computable inverse exponentially decaying bound.

individual s_is, we get the following bound. For every $x \in A^{n+1}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}|s_{n+1}(x) - s_n(x)| &= \left|\sum_{i=1}^{n+1} 2^{-i} s_{i,n+1}(x) - \sum_{i=1}^{n} 2^{-i} s_{i,n}(x)\right| \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left[2^{-i}(s_{i,n+1}(x) - s_{i,n}(x))\right] + 2^{-(n+1)} s_{i,n+1}(x).\end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{x \in \Sigma_A^{n+1}} |s_{n+1}(x) - s_n(x)| P_A(x) &\leq \sum_{i=1}^{n} 2^{-i}\theta^{n+1} + 2^{-(n+1)} s_{i,n+1}(x)\theta^{n+1} \\ &< 2\theta^{n+1} + 2^{-(n+1)} \frac{1}{\theta^{n+1}} \theta^{n+1} \\ &= 2\theta^{n+1} + 2^{-(n+1)}.\end{aligned}$$

Case II. Now suppose that for every n, there is a central skeleton in x of rank $r \geq n$ such that $\ell(S_{x,r,0}) < L_r$. This implies that within at most $L_r(N_r - 1)$ characters around x_0, the block 0^{N_r} will occur in x.

Consider the function $g_r : A^* \to [0, \infty)$ defined by

$$g_r^k(\lambda) = \frac{1}{2^r L_r(N_r - 1)}$$

$$g_r^k(a_1\ w\ a_2) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{P_A(0w0|w)} g_r(w) & \text{if } k \leq |w| < L_r(N_r - 1) \text{ and } a_1a_2 = 00 \\ 0 & \text{if } k \leq |w| < L_r(N_r - 1) \text{ and } a_1a_2 \neq 00 \\ g(w) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

As in case I, we can verify that for all cylinders w,

$$g_r^k(w) P_A(w) = \sum_{a_1a_2 \in \Sigma^2} g_r^k(a_1\ w\ a_2) P_A(a_1\ w\ a_2).$$

Consider the function $g_r : A^* \to [0, \infty)$ defined by

$$g_r = \sum_{k=1}^{L_r(N_r-1)} g_r^k.$$

We know that if x has a deficient rank r at length k, then

$$g_r(x) \geq \frac{1}{2^r} \frac{1}{L_r(N_r - 1) P_A(0)^{N_r}} \geq 1$$

if we choose large N_r in a suitable manner.

Finally, consider the aggregate function $S : \Sigma_A^\infty \to [0, \infty)$ defined by $S = \sum_{r=1}^\infty \sup_n g_r^k(x[-n \dots n])$. Then, as in case I, we see that S is Schnorr layerwise lower semicomputable and integrable. Since by assumption x has infinitely many r for which g_r attains at least 1, we have that $S(x) = \infty$. □

We will now proceed to choose this sequence of L_rs that is assumed in Lemma 19.

5.3 Effectively determining L_r and Filler lemma

In the last subsection, we assume that we have a sequence $L_0 < L_1 < \dots$ of natural numbers. For every $i, r \in \mathbb{N}$ and $x \in \mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{C}$, a skeleton in x of rank r at position i was the shortest string centered at $x[i]$ and delimited by the earliest appearance of at least N_r many zeroes and at least L_r many spaces. We now see how to determine this sequence in a Schnorr layerwise lower semicomputable manner.

We define a sequence of $\langle L_r \rangle_{r=1}^\infty$ for the lengths of the skeletons of rank r inductively. We choose the sequence $\langle N_r \rangle_{r=1}^\infty$ such that a skeleton of rank r has length at least L_r. We compute the lengths L_r layerwise, in such a way that properties analogous to the asymptotic equipartition property hold for the skeletons of rank r for every Schnorr random sequence. This will allow us to construct a provably isomorphic map between $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{C}$.

Let $\eta_r = \min_{D \in \{A,C\}} \min_{a \in \Sigma_D, b \in \Sigma_D} P_D(x[1] = a \mid x[0] = b, r)$ and θ_r be the corresponding maximum. For a mixing Markov chain, these will be bounded away from 0 and 1. Here, η_r and θ_r are computable.

We pick a strictly increasing sequence $\langle L_r \rangle_{r=1}^\infty$ such that:[8]

$$\lim_{r \to \infty} \frac{1}{\eta_r} 2^{-L_r(\varepsilon_{r-1} - \varepsilon_r)} = 0$$

.

Let $\mathcal{F}(S) \subseteq \Sigma_A^\ell$ denote the set of fillers for S in $\mathcal{A}$. Let Z_S denote the indices of 0s in S and let the blanks be in positions $B = (s_1, s_2, \dots s_\ell)$. Given a filler $F \in \mathcal{F}(S)$ and an index set $I \subseteq B$, let $\langle I, F, S \rangle$ denote the cylinder generated by setting 0s from S and setting i^{th} position for $i \in I$ with the corresponding symbol in the filler F.

For an $n \in \mathbb{N}, n \geq r$,[9] we define an equivalence relation $\sim_n$ for error bound ε_n on $\mathcal{F}(S)$ and denote equivalence class of F by $\tilde{F}_n$. We decide a

[8] Here we deviate from the original construction.

[9] We define $J(F, n)$ only when $n \geq r$

subset of places $J(F,n) \subseteq \{s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_\ell\}$ for each F and declare $F \sim_n F'$ if $J(F,n) = J(F',n)$ and F agrees with F' on $J(F,n)$.

For a fixed $n \geq r$ and F, we define J inductively on the rank of the skeleton. For a skeleton S of rank 1 and length ℓ, we proceed as follows. For a $k \leq l$, let B_k denote $(s_1, \ldots, s_k)$. Pick the largest positive integer k, $k \leq \ell$ such that $P_A(\ \langle B_k, F, S\rangle,\ n\ )$ is at least $3/2\eta_1 2^{-(\ell+|Z_S|)(H-\epsilon_1)}$. Then, let $J(F,n) = Z_S \cup B_k$.

Now, for a rank $r \geq 2$ skeleton S and $F \in \mathcal{F}(S)$, we do the following: Let us assume that $S = S_1 \times S_2 \times \ldots \times S_t$ is the skeleton decomposition of S where each S_i is of rank $r-1$. Also let $F_1, F_2, \ldots, F_t$ are the corresponding fillers which coincides with F. We assume that we have determined $J(F_i, n\log 3t)$ inductively for each F_i. Let $J_0(F,n) = \cup_{i=1}^{t} J(F_i, n\log 3t)$.[10] These are the positions in S which have already been determined in the previous rank.

Also, let $\{s_1, \ldots s_\ell\} \setminus J_0(F,n) = (t_1 \ldots t_u)$. These are the positions in the skeleton S which have not been fixed by any rank $r-1$ sub-skeletons. Let $T_k = (t_1, \ldots, t_k)$, for $k \leq \ell$. Then, we set $J(F,n) = Z_S \cup J_0(F,n) \cup T_k$, where $k \leq u$ is the largest index such that $P_A(\ \langle T_k \cup J_0(F,n), F, S\rangle, n\ )$ exceeds $\frac{(1+\varepsilon_r)}{\eta_r} 2^{-(\ell+|Z_S|)(H-\varepsilon_r)}$. Here, $\eta_r/(1+\varepsilon_r)$ is a pessimistic approximation of true minimum conditional probability of an alphabet.

Let $x = 0^{l_1} x_1 0^{\ell_2} x_2 0^{\ell_3} \ldots 0^{\ell_t} x_t 0^{\ell_{t+1}}$ be a string where $\ell_i > m$ for all $1 \leq i \leq t+1$. Let

$$P'_A(x,n) = \frac{\prod_{i=1}^{t} P_A(0^{\ell_i} x_i 0^{\ell_{i+1}}, n\log 3t)}{\prod_{i=2}^{t} P_A(0^{\ell_i})}.$$

By the Markov property,

$$\left|P_A(x) - P'_A(x,n)\right| \leq \varepsilon_n P'_A(x,n). \tag{2}$$

So, $P'_A(x,n)$ can be used in place of $P_A(x,n)$ but for the fact we cannot compute $P_A(0^{\ell_i})$ exactly. But we use the essentially multiplicative nature of P'_A and that it approximates P_A in the proof of Lemma 25. The approximation is as follows: $|P_A(x,n) - P'_A(x,n)| \leq 2\varepsilon_r P_A(x,n)$ – this is the essential observation which makes our construction possible.

Also, we note that for a given $F \in \mathcal{F}(S)$ and an integer n, $J(F,n) \subseteq J(F,n+1)$. In other words, if we decrease the error bound in estimation of probability the equivalence relation can only get finer. Similar relations holds for $\mathcal{C}$. Then the asymptotic equipartition property of mixing Markov chains yields the following bounds.

[10] The purpose of $n\log 3t$ will be clear in lemma 25

Lemma 20 (Filler Lemma)**.** *There is a Schnorr layering $\langle K''_p\rangle_{p=1}^{\infty}$ such that for every n, there is a large enough $r \geq n$ such that for every skeleton S of rank r and length ℓ corresponding to $x \in K''_r$, we have the following.*

1. *For all $F \in \mathcal{F}(S)$, $P_A\left(\tilde{F}_r, r\right) \geq (1+\varepsilon_r)2^{-L(H-\varepsilon_r)}$*
2. *For all $F \in \mathcal{F}(S)$ except maybe on a set of measure ε_n:*
   (a) $P_A(\tilde{F}_r, r) < \frac{1+\varepsilon_n}{\eta_n} 2^{-L(H-\varepsilon_n)}$
   (b) $\frac{1}{L}|J(F,r)| > 1 - \frac{2}{|\log_2 \theta_r|}\varepsilon_n$

where $L = \ell + |Z_S|$.

Proof. From the asymptotic equipartition property for Markov chains (see, for example, Chapter 1 of Khinchin [16]), we know that there is a Schnorr layering $\langle K''_p\rangle_{p=1}^{\infty}$ defined below.

For all p there is a k_p so that for all $k \geq k_p$, $\Sigma_A^k = K''_p \cup (K''_p)^c$ is the largest set with the following properties:

- $P_A(K''_p) \geq 1 - \varepsilon_p$
- For each $x \in K''_p$ we have

$$\frac{1-\varepsilon_p}{\eta_p} 2^{-k(H+\varepsilon_p)} < P_A(x,p) < \frac{1+\varepsilon_p}{\eta_p} 2^{-k(H-\varepsilon_p)}.$$

Since the last condition can be decided by examining $x[-p \ldots p]$ and P_A is computable, it follows that $P_A(K''_p)$ is computable, uniformly in p.

Now given an n, let n' be such that $2\varepsilon_{n'} \leq \varepsilon_n$. Let $r \geq n+1$ be such that $L_r \geq k_{n'}$. Such an r exists, since $\{L_r\}$ is an increasing sequence. For brevity, we denote $J_0(F) \cup \{t_1, \ldots, t_w\}$ by J_1.

1. Let $J(F,r) = Z_S \cup J_1$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} P_A(\tilde{F}_r, r) &= P_A(\langle J_1, F, S\rangle, r) \\ &= P_A(J_1, F, S\rangle, r) \times P_A(F[t_w]|\langle J_1, F, S\rangle, r) \\ &\geq \frac{1+\varepsilon_r}{\eta_r} 2^{-L(H-\varepsilon_r)} \times P_A(F[t_w]|\langle J_1, F, S\rangle, r) \\ &\geq (1+\varepsilon_r)2^{-L(H-\varepsilon_r)}. \end{aligned}$$

   where the inequality before the last follows from the definition of $J(F,r)$.

2. (a) If $|J(F,r)|< L$, then by the definition of $J(F,r)$, we have

$$P_A(\tilde{F}_r, r) < \frac{1+\varepsilon_r}{\eta_r} 2^{-L(H-\varepsilon_r)}.$$

If $|J(F,r)|= L$, then $\tilde{F}_r = F$. But $|F|= L \geq L_n \geq k_{n'}$ and hence

$$P_A(F,r) < \frac{1+\varepsilon_{n'}}{\eta_{n'}} 2^{-L(H-\varepsilon_{n'})}$$

unless $F \in (K''_r)^c$ and $P_A((K''_r)^c) \leq \varepsilon_{n'} < \varepsilon_n$. Since $\varepsilon_r < \varepsilon'_n < \varepsilon_n$, we have $\frac{1+\varepsilon_r}{\eta_r} 2^{-L(H-\varepsilon_r)} < \frac{1+\varepsilon_{n'}}{\eta_{n'}} 2^{-L(H-\varepsilon_{n'})} < \frac{1+\varepsilon_n}{\eta_n} 2^{-L(H-\varepsilon_n)}$ (from definition of L).

(b) Without loss of generality, assume that (a) holds. (Otherwise we already have that such F has to be in ε_r measure set.) Let $L - |J(F,r)| \geq 2L\varepsilon_n / |\log_2 \theta_r|$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} P_A(F,r) &= P_A(\tilde{F}_r, r) \times \prod_{i \notin J(F,r)} P_A(F[i] | \langle J_1, F, S \rangle, r) \\ &\leq P_A(\tilde{F}_r, r) \cdot \theta_r^{2L\varepsilon_n / |\log_2 \theta_r|} \\ &< \frac{1+\varepsilon_{n'}}{\eta_{n'}} 2^{-L(H-\varepsilon_{n'})} 2^{-2L\varepsilon_n} \\ &< \frac{1+\varepsilon_n}{\eta_n} 2^{-L(H-\varepsilon_n)} 2^{-2L\varepsilon_n} \end{aligned}$$

We use the inequality $\theta^{1/|\log_2 \theta|} \leq 2^{-1}$. In this case F must belong to the set $(K'_r)^c$ of measure less than $\varepsilon_{n'}$. Hence the set on which L can violate the bound has measure $< 2\varepsilon_{n'} \leq \varepsilon_n$.

□

5.4 Societies and Marriage Lemma

Once we have determined the filler alphabets and filler probabilities for $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{C}$, we are now in a position to start building the isomorphism between cylinders from $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{C}$ which have identical skeletons. Each cylinder in $\mathcal{A}$ has multiple possible matches in $\mathcal{C}$ and conversely. We model this as a bipartite graph with the filled-in skeletons from $\mathcal{A}$ forming the left set of vertices, and those from $\mathcal{C}$ forming the right set. The presence of an edge represents a potential match between the corresponding vertices. We obtain this by a minor variant of Keane and Smorodinsky's marriage lemma, where

the variation is forced by the fact that we have only an approximation of the actual probabilities of the vertices.

Let us assume we are given two probability space (Ω_1, μ_1), (Ω_2, μ_2), with both Ω_1 and Ω_2 finite. A *society* or a *knowledge relationship* is a map $f : \Omega_1 \to 2^{\Omega_2}$ so that for all $X \subseteq \Omega_1$, we have $\mu_1(X) \leq \mu_2(f(X))$ where $f(X)$ is defined in the natural way. When the underlying probabilities are clear from context, we denote a society as $f : \Omega_1 \rightsquigarrow \Omega_2$. Now consider the undirected knowledge graph constructed out of the knowledge relationship, with vertices set $\Omega_1 \cup \Omega_2$ and edge set $E = E_1 \cup E_1^{-1}$ where $E_1 = \{(a, b) \in \Omega_1 \times \Omega_2 : b \in f(a)\}$. Note that the knowledge graph is bipartite by definition. Now we define a couple of notions which provides us with the tools necessary for defining isomorphism:

Definition 21 (Join of societies)**.** Given societies $f_i : \Omega_{i,1} \rightsquigarrow \Omega_{i,2}$ for $1 \leq i \leq j$, we define their join $f : \Omega_{1,1} \times \Omega_{2,1} \times \ldots \Omega_{j,1} \stackrel{prod}{\longrightarrow} \Omega_{1,2} \times \Omega_{2,2} \times \ldots \Omega_{j,2}$ as a map $f : \Omega_{1,1} \times \Omega_{2,1} \times \ldots \Omega_{j,1} \to 2^{\Omega_{1,2} \times \Omega_{2,2} \times \ldots \Omega_{j,2}}$ where $(\omega_1, \omega_2, \ldots \omega_j) \in f(\nu_1, \nu_2, \ldots \nu_j)$ for $\omega_i \in \Omega_{i,2}$, $\nu_i \in \Omega_{i,1}$ iff $\omega_i \in f_i(\nu_i)$.

Definition 22 (ε-robust)**.** Consider a society f between probability spaces (Ω_1, μ_1), (Ω_2, μ_2). Consider the undirected knowledge graph $G = V_1 \cup V_2 \cup \cdots \cup V_w$ where V_is are connected components of G. Given an $\varepsilon > 0$, society f is called ε-robust if for all $1 \leq i \leq m$, for all $X \subset V_i \cap \Omega_1$ and for all $Y \subset V_i \cap \Omega_2$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_1(X)(1+\varepsilon) &\leq \mu_2(f(X))(1-\varepsilon) \\ \mu_2(Y)(1+\varepsilon) &\leq \mu_1(f^{-1}(Y))(1-\varepsilon). \end{aligned}$$

It is easy to see that for $\varepsilon > 0$, an ε-robust society is a society.

Note that we only consider proper subsets X and Y in the above definition, since $\mu_1(V_i \cap \Omega_1) = \mu_2(V_i \cap \Omega_2)$. This easily follows from the fact that f and f^{-1} are societies. Also note that a society f is ε-robust iff the dual of the society f^{-1} is ε-robust.

A society is *minimal* if the removal of any edge will violate the condition for a society. In the construction of an isomorphism, we consider various minimal sub-societies of given societies. Now since we only have some approximation of probabilities of vertices, we have to be careful while removing edges from knowledge graph to construct minimal sub-society. The next lemma shows that it is enough to consider ε-robust minimal societies for our purpose.

Lemma 23. *Given a society f between probability spaces (Ω_1, μ_1), (Ω_2, μ_2) and a minimal sub-society g, there is an $\varepsilon > 0$ so that g is ε-robust.*

Proof. We know that the minimal sub-society g is generated by a joining[11], say μ - that is, a joint distribution μ on $\Omega_1 \times \Omega_2$ such that μ_1 and μ_2 are its marginals(see Chapter 6 of [27]). Consider the knowledge graph G for the society g. Note that G is a finite graph. Let $G = V_1 \cup V_2 \cup \cdots \cup V_w$, where V_is are the connected components. Consider any arbitrary component V_i. Let $X \subset V_i \cap \Omega_1$. Now $X \subset g^{-1}(g(A))$. So,

$$\begin{aligned}\mu_1(X) &= \sum_{a\in X} \mu_1(a) = \sum_{a\in X} \sum_{b\in g(X)} \mu(a,b) \\ &< \sum_{a\in g^{-1}(g(X))} \sum_{b\in g(X)} \mu(a,b) = \sum_{b\in g(X)} \sum_{a\in g^{-1}(g(X))} \mu(a,b) = \mu_2(g(X))\end{aligned}$$

Using a similar argument, we can show that for $Y \subset V_i \cap \Omega_2$, $\mu_2(Y) < \mu_1(g^{-1}(Y))$. So there is an $\varepsilon' > 0$ so that $\mu_1(X)(1+\varepsilon) \leq \mu_2(f(X))(1-\varepsilon)$ and $\mu_2(Y)(1+\varepsilon) \leq \mu_1(f^{-1}(Y))(1-\varepsilon)$. Let ε be minimum of all such ε' where minimum is taken over all i, X and Y. □

Now we quote a variant of the Marriage Lemma.

Lemma 24 (Marriage Lemma)**.** *For any given society S between (Ω_1, μ_1) and (Ω_2, μ_2), any minimal subsociety R has the property that $|\Omega_2| > |\{w \in \Omega_2 : (\exists w_1, w_2 \in \Omega_1)(w_1 \neq w_2 \wedge w_1 R w \wedge w_2 R w)\}|$.*

The proof is exactly analogous to [15], see Chapter 6 of [27].

During the construction of the isomorphism, we compute various minimal subsocieties. There can be many such minimal subsocieties and "inconsistent" choices in different stages may break the construction. In the following subsections, we describe a way of choosing the minimal subsocieties such that the construction goes through.

5.5 Construction of the isomorphism

We now have a skeleton S common to two sequences $x \in \Sigma_A^\infty$ and $y \in \Sigma_C^\infty$, and have defined an equivalence relation on the fillers for S in Σ_A^* and Σ_C^* for a desired level of error. We now inductively build societies between equivalence classes of fillers of $\mathcal{A}$ and of $\mathcal{C}$ and use the marriage lemma from the preceding section to define an isomorphism between $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{C}$. A minor technical issue arises here owing to the fact that we only have approximations of probabilities of $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{C}$ during computation of canonical minimal subsociety.

[11] In the literature, the joining operation is also known as coupling.

Given a skeleton S of rank r, $r \geq 1$, and length ℓ, let $\mathcal{F}(S)$ and $\mathcal{G}(S)$ denote the set of its fillers in $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{C}$. Given $n \geq r$, let $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}(S,n)$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}(S,n)$ denote the set of equivalence classes with respect to the equivalence relation $\sim_n$ (i.e, $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}(S,n) = \{\tilde{F}_n : F \in \mathcal{F}(S)\}$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}(S,n) = \{\tilde{G}_n : G \in \mathcal{G}(S)\}$) . We denote the ε_n-robust societies between $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}(S,n)$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}(s,n)$ by induction on r: $R_{S,n} : \tilde{\mathcal{F}}(S,n) \rightsquigarrow \tilde{\mathcal{G}}(S,n)$ if r is odd , and $R_{S,n} : \tilde{\mathcal{G}}(S,n) \rightsquigarrow \tilde{\mathcal{F}}(S,n)$ otherwise. The measure for every $F \in \tilde{\mathcal{F}}(S,n)$ is $P_A(F,n)$ and that for every $G \in \tilde{\mathcal{G}}(S,n)$ is $P_C(G,n)$.

Fix an n. For $r = 1$, build a trivial society where each of $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}(S,n)$ knows each of $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}(S,n)$. Construct a minimal ε_n-robust sub-society $R_{S,n}$ of the trivial society.

Now we describe the inductive construction: let $r > 1$ be even. Let S be a skeleton of rank r. Let $S = S_1 \times S_2 \times \ldots \times S_t$ be a rank $r-1$ skeleton decomposition of S. Assume that we have a procedure to define societies for all S_i ranks at most $r-1$ and to any desired precision. Let us consider $R_{S,n\log 3t} : \tilde{\mathcal{F}}(S_i, n\log 3t) \rightsquigarrow \tilde{\mathcal{G}}(S_i, n\log 3t)$ for $i = 1, 2, \ldots t$. Note that we are using induction only on r and not n – for a higher precision, we repeat the induction procedure from scratch. Consider their duals $R^*_{S,n\log 3t} : \tilde{\mathcal{G}}(S_i, n\log 3t) \rightsquigarrow \tilde{\mathcal{F}}(S_i, n\log 3t)$. Construct the join of societies $R : \tilde{\mathcal{G}}(S_1, n\log 3t) \times \tilde{\mathcal{G}}(S_2, n\log 3t) \times \ldots \times \tilde{\mathcal{G}}(S_t, n\log 3t) \xrightarrow{prod} \tilde{\mathcal{F}}(S_1, n\log 3t) \times \tilde{\mathcal{F}}(S_2, n\log 3t) \times \ldots \times \tilde{\mathcal{F}}(S_t, n\log 3t)$.

Let $\overline{\mathcal{F}}(S,n) = \tilde{\mathcal{F}}(S_1, n\log 3t) \times \ldots \times \tilde{\mathcal{F}}(S_t, n\log 3t)$ and $\overline{\mathcal{G}}(S,n) = \tilde{\mathcal{G}}(S_1, n\log 3t) \times \ldots \times \tilde{\mathcal{G}}(S_t, n \cdot \log 3t)$. So, $R : \overline{\mathcal{G}}(S,n) \rightsquigarrow \overline{\mathcal{F}}(S,n)$.

Lemma 25. *The R constructed above is ε_n-robust with respect to measure $P_C(\cdot, n)$ and $P_A(\cdot, n)$.*

We omit the proof – it is routine to verify the conditions of robust society hold when we approximate $P_A()$ and $P_C()$ with $P'_A()$ and $P'_C()$ and use equation 2.

Since $\overline{\mathcal{F}}(S,n)$ is determined by $J_0(F,n)$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}(S,n)$ is determined by $J(F,n)$, the latter is the finer equivalence class. So we may consider $R : \overline{\mathcal{G}}(S,n) \rightsquigarrow \tilde{\mathcal{F}}(S,n)$, where each $\overline{\mathcal{F}}(S,n)$ is split into multiple $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}(S,n)$s and the knowledge relation is extended accordingly. Construct *the* minimal ε_n-robust sub-society U of R. From U, construct $R_{S,n} : \tilde{\mathcal{G}}(S,n) \rightsquigarrow \tilde{\mathcal{F}}(S,n)$ such that $R_{S,n}(\tilde{\mathcal{G}}(S,n)) = U(\overline{\mathcal{G}}(S,n))$ where $\overline{\mathcal{G}}(S,n)$ is uniquely determined by the finer equivalence class $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}(S,n)$.

We construct the canonical ε_n-robust minimal sub-society by progressively constructing ε_i-robust minimal sub-societies for $1 \leq i \leq n$. For ε_{i+1}-robust minimal sub-society, we start with the ε_i-robust minimal sub-society

and keep removing edges from it as long as it remains an ε_{i+1}-robust society. This can be done in a computable manner, since checking whether a finite bipartite graph is ε_n-robust is computable.

For odd r, we switch the role of F and G.

Now let us describe the construction of the isomorphism: For an $x \in K'_{r'} \cap K''_{r'}$, let S_{x,r,i_r} denote the skeleton of rank r which occurs in x, where i_r is the current central co-ordinate. Given an $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_r(x,n)$ denote the equivalence class of fillers that occur in x corresponding to $S_r(x)$ with respect to the equivalence relation $\sim_n$. We use a similar notation for $\mathcal{C}$ where $\mathcal{G}$ replaces $\mathcal{F}$.

For $x \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $x \in K'_{r'} \cap K''_{r'}$ we find a large enough even r (this r is computable from r') such that $\forall \overline{G}_r(x,r) \in R^{-1}_{S_r(x),r}(\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_r(x,r))$, we have that $\overline{\mathcal{G}}_r(x,r)[i_r]$ is defined (it stabilizes thenceforth). Now the shift preserving map ϕ is so defined that

$$(\phi(x))[0] = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if the block of 0 containing } i_r \text{ is longer than 1} \\ \overline{\mathcal{G}}_r(x,r)[i_r] & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Note that this definition specifies all the co-ordinates of $\phi(x)$ because the we want it to be shift preserving.

It is known that if a measure-preserving shift applied to a Martin-Löf random x yields a Martin-Löf random point [21], [7],[30]. The following lemma is a straightforward extension to Schnorr randoms.

Lemma 26. *Suppose $T : X \to X$ is a computable measure-preserving transformation on a computable probability space $(X, \mathcal{F}, P)$. Then the image of every Schnorr random in X under T is Schnorr random.*

This follows from the fact that if $\langle U_n \rangle_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a Schnorr layering of X, then so is $\langle T^{-1}U_n \rangle_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$, since T is measure-preserving and computable.

This concludes the description of the algorithm for constructing ϕ.

5.6 Proof that ϕ is a layerwise lower semicomputable isomorphism

Now we show that ϕ is an isomorphism and well-defined n every Schnorr random element in $\mathcal{A}$, that ϕ^{-1} is well-defined for every Schnorr random element in $\mathcal{C}$, and that the candidate isomorphism ϕ is Schnorr layerwise lower semicomputable.

5.6.1 ϕ is isomorphic

We show that we can always find an r sufficiently large to stabilize the construction of the society, Let us consider the case when for a given r-rank skeleton S, n is so large that $R_{S,n}$ stabilizes (*i.e.*, it remains unchanged for any larger n) – such a n exists due to Lemma 23 and the fact that $J(\cdot, n)$s are non-decreasing in n and bounded above. Call such stabilized society $R_S : \overline{\mathcal{G}}(S) \rightsquigarrow \tilde{\mathcal{F}}(S)$. Then the following result holds.

Lemma 27 (Assignment Lemma)**.** *If $x \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $x \in G_{r'} \cap G'_{r'}$ with $x[0]$ not contained in a block of 0 longer than m, then there is an even r, computable from r', such that*

1. *With respect to the society $R_{S_r(x)} : \overline{\mathcal{G}}(S_r(x)) \rightsquigarrow \tilde{\mathcal{F}}(S_r(x))$, $R^{-1}_{S_r(x)}(\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_r(x))$ is a singleton, say, $\overline{\mathcal{G}}_r(x)$.*
2. *$i_r(x) \in J_0(\overline{\mathcal{G}}_r(x))$.*

We omit the proof of this lemma – it is similar to the proof of the assignment lemma given in [27] where we use the estimates given by lemma 20.

Now we show how the above lemma ensures the existence of the map ϕ for every $x \in G_{r'} \cap G'_{r'}$. If the co-ordinate i_r is part of a block of 0 of length at least 2, then we are done. Otherwise, the above lemma shows that for each $x \in G_{r'} \cap G'_{r'}$, there is a sufficiently large r, computable from r' such that for all sufficiently large n, $(\overline{\mathcal{G}}_r(x))_{i_r}$ becomes fixed – this is defined to be $\phi(x)[0]$. Let r_1 be greater than n and r. Since $R_{S_{r_1}(x),r_1}$ is derived from $R_{S_r(x),n}$ (via the construction of consistent minimal sub-society), we have that all $\overline{\mathcal{G}}_{r_1}(x, r_1)$ which know some $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_{r_1}(x, r_1)$ have the coordinate i_r fixed with same symbol $(\overline{\mathcal{G}}_r(x))_{i_r}$. Hence at this r_1 we can level off the inductive construction we can compute $\phi(x)[0]$.

Finally we show that ϕ is indeed an isomorphism. The map is by construction measurable, and shift-invariant. We only need to show that it is measure-preserving. We use a similar technique as in the original proof. Consider $x \in \mathcal{C}$ specified by fixing z consecutive co-ordinates for some z. We show that for all $Y \in \Sigma^z_C$, $P_A(\phi^{-1}(Y)) \geq P_C(Y)$. Consequently, ϕ is measure-preserving on the algebra Σ^z_C. This is sufficient, since elements of Σ^z_C over all z generate the σ-algebra Σ^∞_C.

Let $X = \{x \in \Sigma^\infty_A \mid x[k \dots z+k] = c_{i_k} c_{i_{k+1}} \dots c_{i_{z+k}}\}$. Since both $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{C}$ are stationary and ϕ is shift preserving, we can assume that $k = 0$. Consider $x \in T_C^{-(k+1)} X$, i.e., the symbols in positions $-k-1$ to -1 match

those in corresponding places of C. Now, consider a cylinder xa for $a \in \Sigma_C$. Clearly, $X = \cup_{a \in C} Xa$. Now we use the assignment lemma on cylinder Xa to argue about the measures. The assignment theorem [28] implies for all $x \in G_{r'} \cap G'_{r'}$ there is an r_1 such that $(G_{r'} \cap G'_{r'})^c$ has measure $\delta_{r'}$ and we can find the assignment for $\phi(x)[0]$ in the r_1 level off the inductive construction. Note, $\delta_{r'} \to 0$ as $r' \to \infty$. So,

$$P_C(x) = \sum_{a \in \Sigma_C} P_C(Xa) \leq \sum_{\overline{\mathcal{F}}_{r_1}(Xa) \in R^{-1}_{S_{r_1}(Xa), r_1}(\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_{r_1}(Xa))} P_A(\overline{\mathcal{F}}_r(Xa), r_1) + \delta_{r'}$$
$$\leq P_A(\phi^{-1}(X))(1 - \varepsilon_{r_1}) + \delta_{r'},$$

since the map ϕ respects society and we consider ε_{r_1} robust societies in level r_1. Since $x \in G_s \cap G'_s$ for all $s \geq r'$, we have $P_C(X) \leq P_A(\phi^{-1}(X))$.

5.6.2 Schnorr Layerwise Lower Semicomputability of ϕ

In this section, we recapitulate the major steps in the construction of the isomorphic map ϕ and show that it is Schnorr layerwise lower semicomputable. This yields, as a corollary, that it is defined for every Schnorr random sequence $x \in \mathcal{A}$. We conclude by proving that $\phi(x) \in \mathcal{C}$ is a Schnorr random as well.

We show that there is a Schnorr layering $\langle K^A_r \rangle^\infty_{r=1}$ of $\mathcal{A}$ such that the following holds. For every $x \in K^A_r$, there is a central cylinder $x[\ -m_r + 1 \dots 0 \dots m_r - 1\ ]$ mapped to a central cylinder $y[\ -m_r + 1 \dots 0 \dots m_r + 1\ ]$ such that $P_A(x[-m_r + 1 \dots 0 \dots m_r - 1])$ is approximately $P_C(y[-m_r + 1 \dots 0 \dots m_r - 1])$.

To see this, note that the Schnorr layering $\langle K'_r \cap K''_r \rangle^\infty_{r=1}$ of $\mathcal{A}$, where $\langle K'_r \rangle^\infty_{r=1}$ is the Schnorr layering of $\mathcal{A}$ in the Skeleton Lemma and $\langle K''_r \rangle^\infty_{r=1}$ is its Schnorr layering in the Filler Lemma, has the following property. For every $r \in \mathbb{N}$ and $x \in G_r \cap G'_r$, there is a central skeleton of x of rank r and length L_r, for which every filler $F \in \Sigma_A^{L_r}$ obeys the probability bounds in the filler lemma.

Similarly, there is a Schnorr layering of $\mathcal{C}$ which has the following property. For every $r \in \mathbb{N}$ and y in the r^{th} layer, there is a central skeleton of x of rank r and length L_r, for which every filler $G \in \Sigma_C^{L_r}$ obeys the probability bounds in the filler lemma.

Then we create a bipartite graph among the equivalence classes $\tilde{F}_n$ and $\tilde{G}_n$ of fillers in Σ^{L_r} and $\Sigma_C^{L_r}$, and build the canonical ε_n-robust minimal subsociety. This is a computable process, since the societies are finite. The

assignment lemma yields us a layerwise lower semicomputation of the central co-ordinate $\phi(x)[0]$.

Let T_A and T_C be the shifts associated with $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{C}$, respectively. If x is Schnorr random in $\mathcal{A}$, the computabilty and measure-preservation of T_A ensure that $T_A^i x$, $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ is also Schnorr random in $\mathcal{A}$. Hence for all large enough ranks r', $T_A^i x \in K_{r'}^A$. Noting that $x[i] = (T_A^i x)[0]$ and that ϕ is a factor map, we see that

$$(\phi \circ T_A^i(x))[0] = (T_C^i \circ \phi(x))[0] = (\phi(x))[i],$$

we see that all co-ordinates $\phi(x)[-m+1 \dots 0 \dots m+1]$ will be fixed for all large enough ranks K_r^A. This is an iteration over a Schnorr layerwise lower semicomputable function, hence is Schnorr layerwise lower semicomputable. For ϕ^{-1}, the same argument can be carried out on the dual graph.

Hence the maps ϕ and ϕ^{-1} thus constructed are Schnorr layerwise lower semicomputable and can be computed for all Schnorr random points.

Lemma 28. *Let $t_A : \Sigma_A^\infty \to [0, \infty]$ be a Schnorr layerwise P_A-integrable test. Then $t'_C = t_A \circ \phi^{-1}$ is a Schnorr layerwise P_C-integrable test. Conversely, if $t_C : \Sigma_A^\infty \to [0, \infty]$ be a Schnorr layerwise P_C-integrable test. Then $t'_A = \phi \circ t_A$ is a Schnorr layerwise P_A-integrable test.*

Proof. The function $t'_C = t_A \phi^{-1}$ is layerwise lowersemicomputable. Also, $\int t'_C dP_C = \int t_A \circ \phi^{-1} dP_A$, since ϕ is a measure-preserving isomorphism. Hence $\int t'_C dP_C$ is finite. If $s_1, s_2, \dots$ is the computable sequence of step functions witnessing the L^1 computability of t_A, then $s_1 \circ \phi^{-1}, s_2 \circ \phi^{-1}, \dots$ witnesses the L^1 computability of t'_C. Thus t'_C is a Schnorr layerwise P_C-integrable test.

The proof in the converse direction is similar. □

Corollary 29. *$x \in \mathcal{A}$ is Schnorr random if and only if $\phi(x) \in \mathcal{C}$ is Schnorr random, and $y \in \mathcal{C}$ is Schnorr random if and only if $\phi^{-1}(y) \in \mathcal{A}$ is Schnorr random.*

Proof. Let t_A, t'_A, t_C and t'_C be as in the previous lemma. If $t_A(\phi^{-1}(y)) = \infty$, then $t'_C(y) = \infty$ implying that y is not Schnorr random in $\mathcal{C}$.

Conversely, by a similar argument, we see that for $x \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $\phi(x) \in \mathcal{C}$ is defined, if $\phi(x)$ is not Schnorr random in $\mathcal{C}$, then x is not Schnorr random in $\mathcal{A}$. □

6 Computable isomorphisms

Recall that a *homeomorphism* is a continuous bijection whose inverse is also continuous. It is known (see [27], section 6.5, page 301, excercise 2):

Lemma 30. *Suppose* $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu, T)$ *and* $(Y, \mathcal{C}, \nu, S)$ *be two Bernoulli systems with the same entropy. If* $\phi : X \to Y$ *is a measure-preserving homeomorphism, then* μ *and* ν *are permutations of each other.*

Since total computable functions are continuous, it follows that only trivial computable isomorphisms exist between two computable dynamical systems. This partly justifies layerwise lower semicomputability as a notion of appropriate power for constructing the isomorphism between the systems.

7 Comparison of the results

Ornstein showed that a process satisfying a weaker condition, *viz.* a *finitely determined system* with entropy H is isomorphic to some Bernoulli process with entropy H. Thus elements of a much broader class of processes are isomorphic to Bernoulli systems of equal entropy, the latter being intuitively the *most random systems* possible. Several "deterministic" dynamical systems have been shown to be finitely determined (for a survey, see Ornstein[23]), leading to the interpretation that all such systems are, intuitively, encodings of the most random possible systems. However, to demonstrate this, we need isomorphic maps which are termed *stationary codes*. [31] Rudolph has proved a characterization of systems *finitarily isomorphic* to each other [29], showing that if we restrict our codes to *finitary codes*, there are weakly Bernoulli systems and finitely determined systems which cannot be isomorphic to any Bernoulli system with the same entropy.

We show that computable mixing Markov systems of equal entropy have a *layerwise lower semicomputable* isomorphism. Thus the targets of our isomorphisms are not intuitively as random as that of the Ornstein construction. However, our code has a stronger computability property than Ornstein's original construction and the maps in Rudolph's characterization of finitary isomorphism.

Rudolph's characterization of systems finitarily isomorphic to Bernoulli systems uses the notion of *conditional block independence*. We leave open whether there is a similar characterization of computable systems which are layerwise isomorphic to a computable mixing Markov system.

Acknowledgments

The authors thank Mathieu Hoyrup and Jason Rute for valuable discussions and anonymous referees for their suggestions.

References

[1] Laurent Bienvenu, Adam R. Day, Mathieu Hoyrup, Ilya Mezhirov, and Alexander Shen. A constructive version of Birkhoff's ergodic theorem for Martin-Löf random points. *Inf. Comput.*, 210:21–30, 2012.

[2] Patrick Billingsley. *Ergodic Theory and Information*. John Wiley and Sons, New York, 1965.

[3] M. Braverman. On the complexity of real functions. In *Proceedings of the forty sixth IEEE Annual Symposium on the Foundations of Computer Science*, pages 155–164, 2005.

[4] Johanna Franklin, Noam Greenberg, Joseph S. Miller, and Keng-Meng Ng. Martin-Löf random points satisfy Birkhoff's ergodic theorem with respect to effectively closed sets. *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, 140:3623–3628, 2012.

[5] P. Gács. Unifrom test of algorithmic randomness over a general space. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 341:91–137, 2005.

[6] P. Gács, Mathieu Hoyrup, and Cristóbal Rojas. Randomness on computable probability spaces - a dynamical point of view. *Theory of Computing Systems*, 48(3):465–485, April 2011.

[7] Stefano Galatolo, Mathieu Hoyrup, and Cristóbal Rojas. A constructive Borel-Cantelli lemma. constructing orbits with required statistical properties. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 410(21-23):2207–2222, 2009.

[8] Michael Hochman. Upcrossing inequalities for stationary sequences and applications. *Annals of Probability*, 37(6):2135–2149, 2009.

[9] M. Hoyrup and C. Rojas. An application of Martin-Löf randomness to effective probability theory. In *Proceedings of the 5th conference on Computability in Europe*, 2009.

[10] M. Hoyrup and C. Rojas. Applications of effective probability theory to Martin-Löf randomness. In *Proceedings of the 36th International*

Colloquium on Automata, Logic and Programming, volume 5555/2009, pages 549–561. Springer, 2009.

[11] M. Hoyrup and C. Rojas. Computability of probability measures and Martin-Löf randomness over metric spaces. *Information and Computation*, 207(7):830–847, 2009.

[12] Mathieu Hoyrup. The dimension of ergodic random sequences. In *Symposium on Theoretical Aspects of Computer Science*, pages 567–576, 2012.

[13] M. Keane and M. Smorodinsky. The finitary isomorphism theorem for Markov shifts. *Bull. Am. Math. Soc., New Ser.*, 1:436–438, 1979.

[14] M. Keane and Meier Smorodinsky. A class of finitary codes. *Israel Journal of Mathematics*, 6(3-4):352–371, 1977.

[15] Michael Keane and Meier Smorodinsky. Bernoulli schemes of the same entropy are finitarily isomorphic. *Annals of Mathematics*, 109(2):397–406, 1979.

[16] A. Ya. Khinchin. *Mathematical Foundations of Information Theory*. Dover Publications, 1957.

[17] A. N Kolmogorov. New metric invariants of transitive dynamical systems and automorphisms. *Doklady Akad. Nauk SSSR*, 93:763–766, 1953.

[18] A. N. Kolmogorov. A new invariant for transitive dynamical systems. *Doklady Akad. Nauk SSSR*, 119:861–864, 1958.

[19] P. Martin-Löf. The definition of random sequences. *Information and Control*, 9(6):602–619, 1966.

[20] Kenshi Miyabe. L^1 computability, layerwise computability and Schnorr reducibility. *Computability*, 2:15–29, 2013.

[21] S. Nandakumar. An effective ergodic theorem and some applications. In *Proceedings of the 40th Annual Symposium on the Theory of Computing*, pages 39–44, 2008.

[22] Donald Ornstein. Bernoulli shifts with the same entropy are isomorphic. *Advances in Mathematics*, 4(3):337 – 352, 1970.

[23] Donald Ornstein. Newton's laws and coin tossing. *Notices of the American Mathematical Society*, 60(4):450–459, 2013.

[24] Donald Ornstein and Benjamin Weiss. Entropy is the only finitely observable invariant. *Journal of Modern Dynamics*, 1(1):93–105, 2007.

[25] D.S. Ornstein. Imbedding bernoulli shifts in flows. In *Contributions to Ergodic Theory and Probability*, volume 160 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*, pages 178–218. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 1970.

[26] Cornfield I. P., Fomin S. V., and Sinai Ya. G. *Ergodic Theory*. Springer Verlag, 1982.

[27] Karl Petersen. *Ergodic Theory*. Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, 1989.

[28] H. L. Royden. *Real Analysis*. Prentice Hall, 1988.

[29] Daniel J. Rudolph. A characterization of those processes finitarily isomorphic to a Bernoulli shift. *Ergodic Theory and dynamical systems: Proceedings, special year, Maryland 1979-1980. Edited by A. Katok*, pages 1–64, 1981.

[30] A. Kh. Shen′. The frequency approach to the definition of a random sequence. *Semiotika i Informatika*, 18:14–42, 1982. (In Russian.).

[31] Paul Shields. The interactions between ergodic theory and information theory. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 44(6):2079–2093, 1998.

[32] Ya. G. Sinai. The notion of entropy of a dynamical system. *Doklady Akad. Nauk SSSR*, 125:768–771, 1959.

[33] M. van Lambalgen. *Random Sequences*. Academish Proefschri't, Amsterdam, 1987.

[34] V. G. Vovk. The law of the iterated logarithm for random kolmogorov or stochastic sequences. *SIAM Theory of Probability and Applications*, 32(3):413–425, 1987.

[35] V. V. V'yugin. Ergodic theorems for individual random sequences. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 207:343–361, 1998.